14P20 Rec'd PCY/PTO U6 JUN 2006

Re Point II.

- Point 1. Document DE102004003582.2 was not included in the submission and is not at hand otherwise. For this reason, the validity of the priority of this document cannot be determined.
- Point 2. Although the content of document EP03028023.4 (EP-1431161) is similar, it differs fundamentally from the application:
 - different specification;
 - different figures;
 - different claims.

In this document, the second input shaft is driven by a servomotor in the manner described in Claim 1. The superimposition drive, however, is not configured as a harmonic drive.

A claim to the same subject matter is therefore not justified.

Re Point V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting this statement

Reference is made to the following document(s):

- D1: DE 102 53 465 A1 (ZF LENKSYSTEME GMBH) January 22, 2004 (2004-01-22)
- D2: U.S.-A-6,029,768 (KIYOSAWA ET AL) February 29, 2000 (2000-02-29)

Form PCT/Supplementary Pages/409 (Page 1) (EPA-January 2004)

- D3: DE 197 48 667 A1 (TOYOTA JIDOSHA K.K., TOYOTA,
 AICHI, JP; TOYOTA JIDOSHA K.K., TOYOTA) May 20, 1998
 (1998-05-20)
- Point 3. The subject matter of Claim 1 (and thus of all claims) is novel.

None of the documents mentioned in the Search Report clearly shows a superimposition drive configured with a harmonic drive, in which the servomotor is not supported on the steering column.

Point 4. The subject matter of Claim 1 (and thus of all claims) is novel.

Document D1, regarded as the best related art, shows a harmonic drive, which can be configured as a superimposition drive (see D1, paragraph [0048]), without mentioning detailed construction features in the process.

The subject matter of Claim 1 differs from these known harmonic drives (from D1) by the detailed construction features, according to which the servomotor is not supported on the steering column.

As a result, the problem:

of how to conceive a construction such that the mass of the servomotor does not contribute to increasing the inertia torque of the steering shaft

is solved in an inventive manner, for based on the related art it is not clear how such a superimposition drive should be represented:

Form PCT/Supplementary Pages/409 (Page 2) (EPA-January 2004) NY01 1107631 v1

- D1 (paragraph [0048] contains only a vague reference to superimposition drives.
- To be sure, D3 represents a servomotor separated from the steering shaft (D3, Figure 13) as the related art. But D3 proposes precisely an approach that runs counter to this construction.

Thus one skilled in the art will not be able to deduce in an obvious manner from the related art how to produce a superimposition drive configured as a harmonic drive as recited in Claim 1.